i The

Doc Code: AP.PRE.REO

\*Total of

PTO/SB/33 (07-05)

## Approved for use through xx/xx/200x. OMB 0651-00xx U.S. Patent and Trademark Office; U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE nder the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number. **Docket Number (Optional)** PRE-APPEAL BRIEF REQUEST FOR REVIEW 920476-905054 I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the Filed Application Number United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to "Mail Stop AF, Commissioner for 09/502,699 February 11, 2000 Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450" [37 CFR 1.8(a)] September 14 First Named Inventor Michael F. Grant et al. Examiner 2666 Mehra, Inder P. Typed or printed Tina L. Sieczkowski name Applicant requests review of the final rejection in the above-identified application. No amendments are being filed with this request. This request is being filed with a notice of appeal. The review is requested for the reason(s) stated on the attached sheet(s). Note: No more than five (5) pages may be provided. I am the applicant/inventor. Signature assignee of record of the entire interest. Shakula See 37 CFR 3.71. Statement under 37 CFR 3.73(b) is enclosed. (Form PTO/SB/96) Typed or printed name attorney or agent of record. 312 214-4813 40,808 Registration number Telephone number attorney or agent acting under 37 CFR 1.34. Registration number if acting under 37 CFR 1.34 \_ NOTE: Signatures of all the inventors or assignees of record of the entire interest or their representative(s) are required. Submit multiple forms if more than one signature is required, see below\*.

This collection of information is required by 35 U.S.C. 132. The information is required to obtain or retain a benefit by the public which is to file (and by the USPTO Inis collection or information is required by 35 U.S.C. 132. The information is required to obtain or retain a benefit by the public which is to file (and by the USPTO to process) an application. Confidentiality is governed by 35 U.S.C. 122 and 37 CFR 1.11, 1.14 and 41.6. This collection is estimated to take 12 minutes to complete, including gathering, preparing, and submitting the completed application form to the USPTO. Time will vary depending upon the individual case. Any comments on the amount of time you require to complete this form and/or suggestions for reducing this burden, should be sent to the Chief Information Officer, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, U.S. Department of Commerce, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450. DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED

FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. SEND TO: Mail Stop AF, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

forms are submitted.



920476-905054

## IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In the application of

Michael F. Grant

Serial No.

: 09/502.699

Filed

: February 11, 2000

For

Communication System Architecture and

Operating Methodology Providing a Virtual

Neighbourhood Network

**Examiner** 

: Mehra, Inder P

**Art Unit** 

2666

**Customer number** 

23644

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to the Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on September 14, 2005.

Name of person signing: Tina L. Sieckowsk

Signature:

## **REMARKS IN SUPPORT OF PRE-APPEAL REVIEW**

Honorable Director of Patents and Trademarks

PO Box 1450 --

Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Dear Sir.

In support of applicant's request for Pre-Appeal Review, the applicant refers to papers already of record in the application. Specifically, attention is directed to the response having a date of mailing of March 22, 2005. In that response, applicants point out at pages 15-18 that the examiner has failed to grasp the teachings of United States Patent 5,457,680 to Kamm et al, and is factually incorrect with respect to what is disclosed by the reference.

Kamm et al fails to disclose the limitations of claim 1 "wherein a first of the gateways accesses the core network via an isolated connection to a second of the gateways when an isolated connection to the first gateway is unable to support access to the core network", as explained in the previously filed response. Thus, in view of this missing limitation, the examiner's claim rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102 and 35 U.S.C. § 103, cannot be maintained.

September 14, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

Peter J. Shakula

Registration No. 40,808 Barnes & Thornburg LLP

P.O. Box 2786

Chicago, Illinois 60690-2786

(312) 214-4813

(312) 759-5646 (fax)